

YITP-95-10

Back-Reaction on the Topological Degrees of Freedom in (2+1)-Dimensional Spacetime

MASAFUMI SERIU

*Inter-University Centre for Astronomy and Astrophysics**Post Bag 4, Ganeshkhind, Pune 411007, India*

and

*Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics**Kyoto University, Kyoto 606, Japan[★]*To appear in *Physical Review D*.

★ Present address.

ABSTRACT

We investigate the back-reaction effect of the quantum field on the topological degrees of freedom in (2+1)-dimensional toroidal universe, $\mathcal{M} \simeq T^2 \times \mathbf{R}$. Constructing a homogeneous model of the toroidal universe, we examine explicitly the back-reaction effect of the Casimir energy of a massless, conformally coupled scalar field, with a conformal vacuum. The back-reaction causes an instability of the universe: The torus becomes thinner and thinner as it evolves, while its total 2-volume (area) becomes smaller and smaller. The back-reaction caused by the Casimir energy can be compared with the influence of the negative cosmological constant: Both of them make the system unstable and the torus becomes thinner and thinner in shape. On the other hand, the Casimir energy is a complicated function of the Teichmüller parameters (τ^1, τ^2) causing highly non-trivial dynamical evolutions, while the cosmological constant is simply a constant.

Since the spatial section is a 2-torus, we shall write down the partition function of this system, fixing the path-integral measure for gravity modes, with the help of the techniques developed in string theories. We show explicitly that the partition function expressed in terms of the canonical variables corresponding to the (redundantly large) original phase space, is reduced to the partition function defined in terms of the physical-phase-space variables with a standard Liouville measure. This result is compatible with the general theory of the path integral for the 1st-class constrained systems.

1. Introduction

Topological considerations are necessary in many situations. Since physical laws are usually expressed in terms of local, differential equations, their importance is not prominent at first sight. However, once one proceeds to solve them, one has to take boundary conditions into account, which allow the topological information to enter in the theory. In general relativity, which handles the dynamics of spacetime, the topological properties acquire dynamical meaning and their consideration becomes more significant. The aim of this paper is to present an explicit, detailed investigation of the dynamics of topological degrees of freedom in spacetime, in the context of the back-reaction problem in semiclassical gravity. We concentrate on the case of $(2 + 1)$ -dimensional toroidal spacetime, $\mathcal{M} \simeq T^2 \times \mathbf{R}$, and make use of various techniques developed for the 2- and 3-dimensional gravity. Here, we do not discuss the topology change [1][14]. The term “topological degrees of freedom”, indicates those global parameters, describing the global deformations of the spatial hypersurface, which are of topological origin (the moduli deformations) (§§3 – *b* and Appendix *A*).

As a first preliminary study for the full quantum gravity, it is reasonable to consider the effect of the curvature of a fixed background spacetime on the behavior of quantum matter field, which is the subject of quantum field theory on a curved spacetime [2][3]. Then, the next natural step is the investigation of the influence of such a quantum field on classical spacetime geometry, which is called the back-reaction problem in semiclassical gravity. Usually, one tries to describe this effect by the semiclassical Einstein equation,

$$G_{\alpha\beta} = \alpha < T_{\alpha\beta} > \quad , \quad (1)$$

where $< T_{\alpha\beta} >$ is some c -number, obtained from the energy-momentum tensor operator and the inner-product of some quantum states, and α is an appropriate gravitational constant with physical dimension $[\alpha] = [(\text{length})^{n-2}]$. (Here, n is the spacetime dimension. We treat $\hbar$ as $[\hbar] = [1]$, and set $c = 1$ in this paper.)

There are several uncertain issues and technically complicated points about this treatment. First, it is not clear what kind of quantity should be chosen for $\langle T_{\alpha\beta} \rangle$ [4]. Here, we regard that $\langle T_{\alpha\beta} \rangle$ should be some expectation value, rather than the quantity $\langle out|T_{\alpha\beta}|in \rangle$, since the latter harms the reality and the causal nature of eq.(1) [5][6][7]. Then, if one regards the path-integral formalism as fundamental for quantum gravity, the so-called in-in formalism [8][5][6] should be of more importance than the standard in-out formalism [7]. Second, the regularization of $\langle T_{\alpha\beta} \rangle$ requires complicated, though well-established, techniques, which itself is one main topic of the quantum field theory on a curved spacetime [2][3]. Third, eq.(1) in general becomes complicated, even though $\langle T_{\alpha\beta} \rangle$ has been successfully computed, so that it is difficult to solve it and study the effect of the back-reaction in detail. Fourth, one can show that eq.(1) can be obtained from the first variation of the phase part in the in-in path-integral expression [5][7], in which matter part has been integrated out formally while gravity part is left unintegrated without the explicit fixation of the measure. If one wants to go one step further, however, one should also take care of the effect coming from the path-integral measure for the gravity part. It is usually difficult since a reasonable, general measure has not been fixed yet. Fifth, to speak rigorously, eq.(1) itself contains an inconsistency from the very beginning. Since gravity and matter couple, quantum fluctuations of matter cause corresponding quantum fluctuations of gravity. Thus, there is a limitation in principle to the semiclassical treatment (eq.(1)), because we try to treat gravity classically while matter is treated by quantum theory [7]. Specifying the exact validity conditions for eq.(1) is one of the main topics of semiclassical gravity [7][9][10].

In this paper, we consider a $(2+1)$ -dimensional spacetime $\mathcal{M} \simeq \Sigma \times \mathbf{R}$, with $\Sigma \simeq T^2$, a torus. We choose, as a matter field, a massless conformally coupled scalar field with a conformal vacuum, and investigate explicitly the back-reaction effect, resulting from the Casimir energy of matter, on the topological degrees of freedom, i.e. the modular-deformations of the torus. As is stated above, the topological degrees of freedom is one of the essential ingredients of spacetime dynamics.

However, the back-reaction on topological modes has seldom been discussed so far, partially because such a finite number of degrees of freedom are hidden in infinite number of gravity modes in 4-dimensional spacetime. One advantage of the reduction of the number of dimension from 4 to 3 is that, only the finite topological modes plus a spatial volume remain dynamical for the case of pure gravity, due to the dimensionality [11][12][13]. One can understand this point as follows: When $n = 3$, the spatial metric h_{ab} has 3 independent components at each spatial point, while there are 3 constraints at each point. Thus, redundant infinite number of modes are gauged away and only a finite number of modes remains. Here, we want to investigate the back-reaction effect from matter onto the topological degrees of freedom of spacetime, which would force us to take the matter field into account. To preserve the above-mentioned nice property of the finiteness of the number of degrees of freedom, we choose a model in which the matter field is in a vacuum state on a spatially homogeneous (2+1)-dimensional spacetime. Another advantage of the reduction of dimension in the discussion of topological aspects comes from the fact that 2-dimensional topology is completely classified in a simple manner so that it is easy to construct various topologies [14].

Another good point of this model is that some difficulties and complications stated above of the semiclassical Einstein equation, eq.(1), become simplified and tractable to a great extent in this case:

First, we choose a conformal vacuum $|0\rangle$ as a natural candidate for a vacuum state of matter in our case, and use $\langle 0|T_{\alpha\beta}|0\rangle$ on the right-hand side of eq.(1).

Second, since the background spacetime shall be chosen as (conformally) flat and the matter field is conformally invariant, $\langle T_{\alpha\beta}(g) \rangle$ can be calculated from $\langle T_{\alpha\beta}(\eta) \rangle$ (η : a flat metric) along with the trace-anomaly [2], which simplifies the manipulation. Furthermore, in our case, the spacetime dimension is odd, $n = 3$, so that there is no trace-anomaly [2]. Thus, $\langle T_{\alpha\beta}(g) \rangle$ is related to $\langle T_{\alpha\beta}(\eta) \rangle$ in a simple manner.

Third, because of the dimensionality, eq.(1) is reduced to a set of six first-order

ordinary differential equations and we can investigate the effect of the back-reaction explicitly.

Fourth, we restrict the metrics to a special class, with spatial part being the one for the locally flat metrics on a torus. Thus, we can fix the path-integral measure by the use of the techniques developed in string theories [15][16]. Within this model, we can discuss explicitly the influence on the semiclassical dynamics of gravity. Our treatment corresponds to the minisuperspace approach in quantum cosmology: Putting restrictions on the variables to be quantized (e.g. spatial homogeneity), which is compatible with the classical dynamics, quantum theory is to be constructed within this restricted subclass of variables. Though this treatment is self-consistent as a quantum system, one significant question naturally arises: To what extent such a treatment reflects faithfully the original full quantum theory? From the viewpoint of the original full system, the restrictions are regarded as constraints on the phase space, which can modify the path integral measure for the reduced variables (minisuperspace variables). Our model may be a good test candidate to investigate this point in detail.

Fifth, the (in-in) effective action for gravity, $W[g_+ : g_-]$, becomes relatively simple in our case, and this reduces to $W[\tau_+^1, \tau_+^2, V_+ : \tau_-^1, \tau_-^2, V_-]$, a functional of six functions of t , $(\tau_\pm^1, \tau_\pm^2, V_\pm)$, where $V_\pm$ indicate the spatial 2-volume (area) and $(\tau_\pm^1, \tau_\pm^2)$ are the Teichmüller parameters describing the topological degrees of freedom of a torus. Although the exact calculation of W has already become difficult, we can still estimate its functional form to leading order in $\hbar$. In computing W , our model reveals explicitly the peculiarity of the semiclassical gravity, compared with the standard treatment of the quantum dissipative system, e.g. the Brownian motion [17]: There is no linear coupling between the sub-system (gravity) and the environment (matter field). Their coupling is put in the kinetic term of the matter field. This model might provide the simplest non-trivial example for the investigation of the quantum dissipative system including gravity.

In §2, we recapitulate how to handle quantum fields on topologically non-trivial

spaces: Construct the quantum field theory on $\mathcal{M} \simeq T^2 \times \mathbf{R}$ and calculate the Casimir energy of a massless, conformally coupled scalar field with a conformal vacuum.[2],[3],[19]

In §3, we extract explicitly the topological degrees of freedom of a torus and reduce eq.(1) to a canonical system with a finite number of degrees of freedom [13]. Then, we investigate explicitly the effect of the back-reaction of matter on the dynamics of the topological degrees of freedom. We shall see that the back-reaction makes the system unstable and the torus becomes thinner and thinner as it evolves, while its 2-volume becomes smaller and smaller. These behaviors are universal that is independent of the initial conditions. The asymptotic analysis of the set of dynamical equations justifies this point. We shall also compare our case of the Casimir energy with the case of the negative cosmological constant, since both of them can be regarded as negative energies. Most significant difference is that the Casimir energy is a complicated function of the Teichmüller parameters (τ^1, τ^2) , while the negative cosmological constant is just a constant.

In §4, we investigate the partition function of this system, fixing the measure with the help of the techniques in string theories. We show explicitly that the gauge-fixing reduces the partition function formally expressed in terms of the canonical variables for the (redundantly large) original phase space, to the partition function defined in terms of the physical-phase-space variables with a standard Liouville measure. This result is compatible with the general theory of the path integral for the 1st-class constrained systems. We also estimate the functional form of W to leading order in $\hbar$. Section 5 is reserved for discussions.

2. Quantum field theory on a (2+1)-dimensional toroidal spacetime

This section is for defining the model to be considered, and calculating the energy-momentum tensor in our model, as a preliminary for the next section, where the back-reaction effect is analyzed in detail. Calculating $\langle T_{\alpha\beta} \rangle$ is now a well-established topic, and we just sketch the essence in the context of our model for later uses.

(a) Scalar field on a torus

We consider a (2+1)-dimensional spacetime with topology $T^2 \times \mathbf{R}$. We concentrate on the case when the geometry of the space $\Sigma \simeq T^2$ is locally flat. A flat 2-geometry is endowed on Σ by giving a metric[★],

$$dl^2 = \hat{h}_{ab} d\xi^a d\xi^b \quad , \quad (2-a)$$

where

$$\hat{h}_{ab} = \frac{1}{\tau^2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \tau^1 \\ \tau^1 & |\tau|^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad (2-b)$$

and the periodicities in the coordinates ξ^1 and ξ^2 with period 1 are understood. Here[§], (τ^1, τ^2) are the Teichmüller parameters [15][16] independent of spatial coordinates (ξ^1, ξ^2) , and $\tau := \tau^1 + i\tau^2$, $\tau^2 > 0$. Note that $\sqrt{\hat{h}} := (\det \hat{h}_{ab})^{1/2} = 1$.

The Laplacian operator $\Delta := -1/\sqrt{h} \cdot \partial_a (h^{ab} \sqrt{h} \partial_b)$ on Σ with the line element dl^2 (eq.(2-a, b)) gives the normalized eigenfunctions

$$f_{n_1 n_2}(\xi) = \exp(i2\pi n_1 \xi^1) \cdot \exp(i2\pi n_2 \xi^2) \quad (n_1, n_2 \in \mathbf{Z}) \quad , \quad (4)$$

★ For definiteness, we shall use the symbol $\hat{h}_{ab}$ to represent the particular matrix given by (2-b), while the symbol h_{ab} shall be reserved for more general context, representing a general spatial metric induced on a spatial surface Σ .

§ Throughout this paper, τ^2 always indicates the second component of (τ^1, τ^2) , and not the square of τ . The latter never appears in the formulae.

and the eigenvalues

$$\lambda_{n_1 n_2} = \frac{4\pi^2}{\tau^2} (|\tau|^2 n_1^2 - 2\tau^1 n_1 n_2 + n_2^2) \quad . \quad (5)$$

Now, let us consider a spacetime $\mathcal{M} \simeq \Sigma \times \mathbf{R}$, with a line element $ds^2 = -dt^2 + \hat{h}_{ab} d\xi^a d\xi^b$. The fundamental positive frequency solutions for $\square u(t, \xi^1, \xi^2) = 0$ are^{*}

$$\bar{u}_A(t, \xi) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega_A}} e^{-i\omega_A t} f_A(\xi) \quad , \quad (6)$$

where A stands for $n_1 n_2$ and $\omega_A := \sqrt{\lambda_A} = \sqrt{\lambda_{n_1 n_2}}$. Afterwards, we follow the standard procedure for the field quantization [2][3].

(b) The model

We shall investigate the back-reaction of the matter field on the topological degrees of freedom (τ^1, τ^2) . The most ideal treatment of the back-reaction described by eq.(1) may be the self-consistent determination of the geometry $g_{\alpha\beta}$ through eq.(1): $\langle T_{\alpha\beta} \rangle$ depends on $g_{\alpha\beta}$, and this $g_{\alpha\beta}$ is self-consistently determined by eq.(1). However, it turns out that such a treatment becomes highly complicated even in our simple model. To make our analysis tractable, then, we treat the back-reaction in the following sense, which is usually adopted in the back-reaction problems [2][3]: We prepare a background spacetime and calculate $\langle T_{\alpha\beta} \rangle$ on it. Then, we discuss the modification of the background geometry due to the $\langle T_{\alpha\beta} \rangle$, using eq.(1).

Now, as a background spacetime, we choose a solution of the vacuum Einstein equation, $G_{\alpha\beta} = 0$. More specifically, we prepare a locally flat spacetime, $ds^2 = -dt'^2 + V dl^2 = V(-dt^2 + dl^2)$, where dl^2 is given by eqs.(2-a, b), and V , τ^1 and τ^2 are chosen to be constant for the background spacetime. (Below, we occasionally

* In connection with the later applications, it is worthwhile to note that, even though τ would depend on t , the form of the equation $\square\psi = 0$ would not change, because of the form of the metric, $g_{\alpha\beta} = (-1, \hat{h}_{ab})$ with $\det g_{\alpha\beta} = -1$.

treat this flat spacetime as conformally flat, just for mathematical convenience.) We choose as a matter field, a massless conformally coupled scalar field ψ ,

$$S_m = -\frac{1}{2} \int (g^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha \psi \partial_\beta \psi + \frac{1}{8} R \psi^2) \sqrt{-g} d^3x \quad . \quad (7)$$

The (improved) energy-momentum tensor operator [3] becomes,

$$T_{\alpha\beta}(g) = \frac{3}{4} \partial_\alpha \psi \partial_\beta \psi - \frac{1}{4} \partial_\gamma \psi \partial^\gamma \psi g_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{4} \psi \partial_\alpha \partial_\beta \psi + \frac{1}{12} \psi \square \psi g_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{8} \psi^2 (R_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{3} g_{\alpha\beta} R). \quad (8)$$

We choose the conformal vacuum as a vacuum state for the matter field. Then, $\langle T_{\alpha\beta}(g) \rangle$ is simply related to $\langle T_{\alpha\beta}(\eta) \rangle$ as,

$$\langle T_{\alpha\beta}(g) \rangle = V^{-1/2} \langle T_{\alpha\beta}(\eta) \rangle \quad , \quad (9)$$

when the metric $g_{\alpha\beta}$ and the flat metric $\eta_{\alpha\beta}$ are related as $g_{\alpha\beta} = V \eta_{\alpha\beta}$.[★] On flat spacetime, the field equation for ψ becomes $\square \psi = 0$, and eq.(6) can be used as fundamental solutions. In this manner, the time evolution of V causes no direct complication in the analysis.

However, the time-dependence of (τ^1, τ^2) caused by the back-reaction harms the self-consistency of the analysis, which is inevitable if the tractability of the back-reaction problem, described by eq.(1), is to be maintained. When (τ^1, τ^2) evolve in time, the functions in eq.(6) are no longer exact solutions for $\square \psi = 0$, because $\omega_A := \sqrt{\lambda_A}$ becomes t -dependent, through the t -dependence of (τ^1, τ^2) (eq.(7)). Furthermore, the spacetime described by $ds^2 = -dt^2 + V(t) \hat{h}_{ab} d\xi^a d\xi^b$ is no longer conformally flat when (τ^1, τ^2) evolves, because of the t -dependence of $\hat{h}_{ab}$. Thus, we should look at the results of the analysis in an adiabatic sense, i.e. valid when terms including $\dot{\tau}^1$ and $\dot{\tau}^2$ are not dominant in the formulae prominently.

★ This simplification occurs, because $\langle T_{\alpha\beta}(g) \rangle$ for a conformally invariant field, with the conformal vacuum, on a conformally flat spacetime is completely determined by $\langle T_{\alpha\beta}(\eta) \rangle$ and the trace anomaly $\langle T^\alpha_\alpha(g) \rangle$, while the latter vanishes when the spacetime dimension is odd [2].

Such a conflict between self-consistency and the tractability of the analysis always occurs in the back-reaction problem. In our present model, this adiabatic treatment provides a good approximation because $\dot{\tau}^1$ and $\dot{\tau}^2$, caused by the back-reaction, turn out to be sufficiently small (see §§3 – c).

We next need Hadamard's elementary function [2][3] $G^{(1)}(x)$ for $ds^2 = -dt^2 + dl^2$ to calculate $\langle T_{\alpha\beta}(\eta) \rangle$. This function and the related energy-momentum tensor have already been extensively investigated [19]. We first compute $G^{(1)}(x)$ for $\mathcal{M} \simeq \mathbf{R}^3$, and afterwards take care of the periodicity in $\mathcal{M} \simeq T^2 \times \mathbf{R}$, adding all contributions from points which should be identified [18][19]. For the 3-dimensional Minkowski space, $G^{(1)}(x)$ is,

$$G^{(1)}(x) := \langle 0 | \{ \psi(x), \psi(y) \} | 0 \rangle = \frac{\hbar}{2\pi} (2\sigma)^{-1/2} \quad (\sigma > 0) \quad , \quad (10)$$

where $\sigma := \frac{1}{2}x^2 = \frac{1}{2}\eta_{\alpha\beta}x^\alpha x^\beta$, $\frac{1}{2}$ times a square of a world distance. Thus we get[★]

$$G^{(1)}(x) = \frac{\hbar}{2\pi} \sum'_{n_1, n_2 = -\infty}^{\infty} (2\sigma_{n_1 n_2}(x))^{-1/2} \quad , \quad (11)$$

where

$$2\sigma_{n_1 n_2}(x) := -t^2 + \frac{1}{\tau^2} |(\xi^1 + n_1) + \tau(\xi^2 + n_2)|^2 \quad .$$

Now it is straightforward to compute $\langle T_{\alpha\beta}(\eta) \rangle$ explicitly:[§] ($\eta_{\alpha\beta} = (-1, \hat{h}_{ab})$ with $(2-b)$.) The result is,

$$\langle T_{00} \rangle = -\frac{\hbar(\tau^2)^{3/2}}{4\pi} \sum'_{n_1 n_2} \frac{1}{|n_1 + \tau n_2|^3} \quad , \quad (12-a)$$

★ The prime attached to the Σ -symbol, like in eq.(11), indicates that the zero-mode ($n_1 = n_2 = 0$) should be excluded from the summation, whenever it causes a divergence.

§ For computation it is helpful to note that $\langle T_{\alpha\beta}(\eta) \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\alpha \partial_{\beta'} G_{\sim}^{(1)}$, where $\partial_\alpha \partial_{\beta'} G_{\sim}^{(1)} := \partial_{x^\alpha} \partial_{x'^\beta} G^{(1)}(x - x')|_{x' \rightarrow x}$ and $x^\alpha := (t, \xi^1, \xi^2)$.

$$\langle T_{11} \rangle = \frac{\hbar(\tau^2)^{1/2}}{4\pi} \sum'_{n_1 n_2} \frac{1}{|n_1 + \tau n_2|^3} - \frac{3\hbar(\tau^2)^{1/2}}{4\pi} \sum'_{n_1 n_2} \frac{(n_1 + \tau^1 n_2)^2}{|n_1 + \tau n_2|^5} , \quad (12-b)$$

$$\langle T_{22} \rangle = \frac{\hbar(\tau^2)^{1/2}|\tau|^2}{4\pi} \sum'_{n_1 n_2} \frac{1}{|n_1 + \tau n_2|^3} - \frac{3\hbar(\tau^2)^{1/2}}{4\pi} \sum'_{n_1 n_2} \frac{(\tau^1 n_1 + |\tau|^2 n_2)^2}{|n_1 + \tau n_2|^5} , \quad (12-c)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T_{12} \rangle &= \langle T_{21} \rangle \\ &= \frac{\hbar\tau^1(\tau^2)^{1/2}}{4\pi} \sum'_{n_1 n_2} \frac{1}{|n_1 + \tau n_2|^3} - \frac{3\hbar(\tau^2)^{1/2}}{4\pi} \sum'_{n_1 n_2} \frac{(n_1 + \tau^1 n_2)(\tau^1 n_1 + |\tau|^2 n_2)}{|n_1 + \tau n_2|^5} , \end{aligned} \quad (12-d)$$

$$\langle T_{0a} \rangle = \langle T_{a0} \rangle = 0 \quad (a = 1, 2) . \quad (12-e)$$

For a metric $g_{\alpha\beta} = V(-1, \hat{h}_{ab})$, $\langle T_{\alpha\beta}(g) \rangle$ can be obtained by eq.(9). Since the Planck scale is the only scale which comes into our model, we understand that a suitable power of $\alpha := l_{\text{Planck}}$ is multiplied to quantities like those in eqs.(12-a) – (12-e), if necessary, in order to adjust their physical dimensions. These contributions of order $\hbar$ to $\langle T_{\alpha\beta} \rangle$ in eqs.(12-a) – (12-e) originate from a non-trivial spatial topology $\Sigma \simeq T^2$, and are well-known as the Casimir effect [2][3].

3. Back-reaction of the Casimir effect on the topological degrees of freedom

(a) The extraction of dynamics of the modular deformations

Having computed $\langle T_{\alpha\beta}(g) \rangle$ in the previous section, we shall now investigate the back-reaction of $\langle T_{\alpha\beta}(g) \rangle$ on the evolution of the spacetime. We consider the Einstein gravity on $\mathcal{M} \simeq T^2 \times \mathbf{R}$ and a massless conformally coupled scalar field on it; $S = \frac{1}{\alpha} \int R \sqrt{-g} + S_m$, where $\alpha := l_{\text{Planck}}$ and S_m is given by eq. (7). The canonical formulation is suitable to investigate the temporal evolution of the spacetime. We thus perform the (2+1)-decomposition, but care should be taken because of the presence of the conformally coupled field. In the back-reaction problem, we regard that $\psi^2(x)$ is replaced by a vacuum expectation value

$\langle \psi^2(x) \rangle$, which is independent of spatial coordinates. Furthermore, we shall finally choose the spatial coordinates s.t. $N^a = 0$ so that $n^a = (-1/N, \vec{0})$. These facts simplify the procedure of $(2+1)$ -decomposition.

Following the standard manipulation [20], we finally get the total action in canonical form,

$$S = \int \pi^{ab} \dot{h}_{ab} - N\mathcal{H} - N^a \mathcal{H}_a \quad , \quad (13-a)$$

where the Hamiltonian constraint and the momentum constraint become, respectively,

$$\mathcal{H} = \{(K_{ab}K^{ab} - K^2 - {}^{(2)}R)/\alpha + \langle T_{\alpha\beta} \rangle n^\alpha n^\beta\} \sqrt{h} \quad , \quad (13-b)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_a/\sqrt{h} = -2D_b(K_a{}^b - \delta_a{}^b K)/\alpha - \langle T_{a\beta} \rangle n^\beta \quad . \quad (13-c)$$

Here, N , N_a are the lapse and the shift functions, $n^\alpha = (-1/N, N^a/N)$ is the normal unit vector of the spatial surface, and ${}^{(2)}R$ stands for the scalar curvature for the spatial surface Σ . The operator D_a is the covariant derivative w.r.t. h_{ab} , and $\pi^{ab} := (K^{ab} - K h^{ab})\sqrt{h}/\alpha$, K_{ab} is the extrinsic curvature of a spatial surface.[★]

We choose a coordinate system s.t. $N^a = 0$ so that $n^\alpha = (-1/N, 0)$. Thus, $\langle T_{a\beta} \rangle n^\beta = -1/N$. $\langle T_{a0} \rangle = 0$ ($a = 1, 2$) from eq.(12-e). In our case, thus, the momentum constraint becomes

$$\mathcal{H}_a/\sqrt{h} = -2D_b(K_a{}^b - \delta_a{}^b K)/\alpha = 0 \quad . \quad (13-c')$$

Then, we can extract the moduli degrees of freedom (corresponding to the global deformations of a torus) by solving eq.(13-c') explicitly [13].

★ Throughout this paper, we use a spatial metric h_{ab} , an induced metric on a spatial surface Σ , to raise and lower the spatial indices, $a, b, c, \dots$, and to define the spatial covariant derivative D_a . In particular, the geometry of our concern is given by the line element, $ds^2 = -dt^2 + Vdl^2$, with $(2-a, b)$. Thus, the spatial metric in our model is $h_{ab} = V\hat{h}_{ab}$, with $(2-b)$.

The system of coordinates in our model ($ds^2 = -dt^2 + Vdl^2$ with $(2-a, b)$) corresponds to York's time-slicing [21], i.e. the time-slicing by the spatial surfaces on which

$$\sigma := -K/\alpha = \text{const} \quad . \quad (14)$$

Thus, eq.(13 - c') is equivalent to

$$\alpha \mathcal{H}_a / \sqrt{h} = -2D_b \tilde{K}_a^b = 0 \quad , \quad (13 - c'')$$

where $\tilde{K}_a^b := K_a^b - \frac{1}{2}\delta_a^b K$, the traceless part of K_a^b . It means that ${}^\star \tilde{K}^{ab} \in \text{Ker} P_1^\dagger$, so that $\tilde{K}^{ab}$ can be expanded in terms of the basis of $\text{Ker} P_1^\dagger$, $\{\Psi^{Aab}\}_{A=1,2}$;

$$\tilde{K}^{ab} = \frac{1}{\alpha} \sum_{A=1}^2 p_A \Psi^{Aab} \quad . \quad (15)$$

In our case, $\Sigma \simeq T^2$, we can choose the lapse function N as $N = N(t)$ without any contradiction with the York's slice. This is shown almost in the same manner as for the case of pure $(2+1)$ -gravity [12][13]. Now, using some basic facts on the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{g=1}$ (see Appendix A), it is straightforward [13] to show that our system is reduced to

$$S = \int dt \sigma \frac{dV}{dt} + \sum_{A=1}^2 p_A \frac{d\tau^A}{dt} - \frac{N(t)}{\alpha} \left(\sum_{A,B=1}^2 \mathcal{G}^{AB} p_{APB} - \frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 \sigma^2 V + \alpha \langle T_{\alpha\beta} \rangle n^\alpha n^\beta V \right). \quad (16)$$

Note that the contribution from the spatial diffeomorphism has been eliminated from dynamics, by solving the momentum constraint (13 - c') explicitly. Only the Weyl deformations and the modular deformations have remained.

★ See Appendix A for the terminology and notations related to the moduli space.

(b) The evolution of the Teichmüller parameters caused by the back-reaction

In our model, $ds^2 = V(-dt'^2 + \hat{h}_{ab}d\xi^a d\xi^b)$. Thus, from eq.(9) and $n^\alpha = (-1/\sqrt{V}, 0)$, we get $\langle T_{\alpha\beta} \rangle n^\alpha n^\beta = V^{-3/2} \langle T_{00} \rangle$, where $\langle T_{00} \rangle$ is given by eq.(12 - a). (Note that this combination is coordinate independent.)

By setting $N(t) = 1$, we get the canonical equations of motion described by the constraint function,

$$\alpha H = \sum_{A,B=1}^2 \mathcal{G}^{AB} p_{AP} p_B - \frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 \sigma^2 V - \hbar \alpha (\tau^2)^{3/2} f(\tau) V^{-1/2} = 0 \quad , \quad (17)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f(\tau^1, \tau^2) &:= \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{n_1, n_2=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{|n_1 + \tau n_2|^3} \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{n_1, n_2=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n_1^2 + 2\tau^1 n_1 n_2 + |\tau|^2 n_2^2)^{3/2}} \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Clearly, $f(-\tau^1, \tau^2) = f(\tau^1, \tau^2)$, $f(\tau^1 + n, \tau^2) = f(\tau^1, \tau^2)$, $f(n + a, \tau^2) = f(n - a, \tau^2)$ (n : integer, a : real) and $f(\tau^1, \tau^2)$ is singular at $(\tau^1, \tau^2) = (n, 0)$. Furthermore, the combination $2\pi(\tau^2)^{3/2} f(\tau^1, \tau^2)$ appearing in (17) is equivalent to the non-holomorphic Eisenstein series $G(\tau, 3/2)$, whose modular invariance as well as other properties are well-known [22]. The first term in eq.(17) is also modular invariant, since it behaves as a scalar field on the moduli space.[★] Thus, the Hamiltonian constraint eq.(17) is modular invariant as it should be. Figures 1 - a, b show the behavior of the function $f(\tau^1, \tau^2)$.

★ Another convenient way for discussing the invariance is to perform the Legendre transformation of the action in concern, and to look at the action in terms of the configuration variables. In this case, the kinetic term for (τ^1, τ^2) becomes proportional to $\sum \mathcal{G}_{AB} \dot{\tau}^A \dot{\tau}^B$, which is clearly modular invariant. For the discussion in the context of the path-integral, including the discussion on the path-integral measure, see §§4 - a.

For the explicit investigation of the dynamics, let us first calculate $\mathcal{G}^{AB}$ according to eqs.(A5) and (A2 - c) with $h_{ab} = \frac{V}{\alpha^2 \tau^2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \tau^1 \\ \tau^1 & |\tau|^2 \end{pmatrix}$. (Note that $ds^2 = -dt^2 + V dl^2$.) Then, we get

$$\mathcal{T}_{1ab} = \frac{V}{\alpha^2 \tau^2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 2\tau^1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{T}_{2ab} = \frac{V}{\alpha^2 (\tau^2)^2} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -\tau^1 \\ -\tau^1 & (\tau^2)^2 - (\tau^1)^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (19 - a)$$

Note that $\{\mathcal{T}_{Aab}\}_{A=1,2}$ are symmetric, traceless 2-tensors satisfying $-2D_b \mathcal{T}_{Aa}{}^b = -2\partial_b \mathcal{T}_{Aa}{}^b = 0$. Thus, $\{\mathcal{T}_{Aab}\}_{A=1,2}$ can also be utilized to form a basis for $\text{Ker} P_1^\dagger$, $\{\Psi^{Aab}\}_{A=1,2}$. By normalizing them to satisfy $(\Psi^A, \mathcal{T}_B) = \delta^A_B$, we obtain,

$$\Psi_{ab}^1 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \tau^2 \\ \tau^2 & 2\tau^1 \tau^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Psi_{ab}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -\tau^1 \\ -\tau^1 & (\tau^2)^2 - (\tau^1)^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (19 - b)$$

Thus, the Weil-Peterson metric reduces to the one which is conformally equivalent to the Poincaré metric,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{AB} &= (\mathcal{T}_A, \mathcal{T}_B) = \frac{2V}{\alpha^2 (\tau^2)^2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathcal{G}^{AB} &= (\Psi^A, \Psi^B) = \frac{\alpha^2 (\tau^2)^2}{2V} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Hence, the geometry conformal to the Poincaré geometry [23] (negative constant curvature geometry) is endowed on the Teichmüller space, which is equivalent to the upper half-plane H_+ ($(\tau^1, \tau^2) \in \mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{R}_+$). Then, the system has been finally reduced to the constraint system $((V, \sigma), (\tau^1, p_1), (\tau^2, p_2); H = 0)$ with

$$\alpha H = \frac{\alpha^2 (\tau^2)^2}{2V} (p_1^2 + p_2^2) - \frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 \sigma^2 V - \hbar \alpha (\tau^2)^{3/2} f(\tau) V^{-1/2} = 0. \quad (21)$$

The equations of motion for (V, σ) are

$$\dot{V} = -\alpha \sigma V \quad (22 - a)$$

$$\dot{\sigma} = \frac{\alpha}{2}\sigma^2 + \frac{\alpha(\tau^2)^2}{2V^2}(p_1^2 + p_2^2) - \frac{\hbar}{2}(\tau^2)^{3/2}f(\tau)V^{-3/2} \quad . \quad (22 - b)$$

The equations of motion for (τ^1, p_1) and (τ^2, p_2) are

$$\dot{\tau}^1 = \frac{\alpha}{V}(\tau^2)^2 p_1 \quad , \quad (23 - a)$$

$$\dot{p}_1 = \hbar(\tau^2)^{3/2} \frac{\partial f(\tau)}{\partial \tau^1} V^{-1/2} \quad , \quad (23 - b)$$

$$\dot{\tau}^2 = \frac{\alpha}{V}(\tau^2)^2 p_2 \quad , \quad (24 - a)$$

$$\dot{p}_2 = -\frac{\alpha}{V}\tau^2(p_1^2 + p_2^2) + \frac{3\hbar}{2}(\tau^2)^{1/2}f(\tau)V^{-1/2} + \hbar(\tau^2)^{3/2} \frac{\partial f(\tau)}{\partial \tau^2} V^{-1/2} \quad (24 - b)$$

First, we should note that the time evolution becomes trivial when there is no matter field, $f(\tau) \equiv 0$, in the following sense: In this case, eqs.(22 - a, b) allow a solution, $\sigma \equiv 0$, $V = \text{const}$, $p_1 = p_2 \equiv 0$. It is clear that, from eqs.(21), (23-a, b) and (24-a, b), equations of motion do not allow any solution, compatible with $\sigma \equiv 0$, $V = \text{const}$, other than $\tau^1 = \text{const}$, $\tau^2 = \text{const}$. This corresponds to the 3-dimensional Minkowski space in the standard coordinates (T, X^1, X^2) with suitable identifications in spatial section (X^1, X^2) described by (τ^1, τ^2) . The unique solution above shows that there is no time evolution with respect to the standard time-slice, $T = \text{const}$ ($\sigma = 0$). This configuration is what we have chosen as a background spacetime. (However, there are different solutions characterized by the initial condition $\sigma \neq 0$. In these cases, (τ^1, τ^2) evolve in time.)

The back-reaction of the quantum field causes a non-trivial evolution of (τ^1, τ^2) , i.e. global deformations of a torus. It is clear from eq.(21) that even when $\sigma \approx 0$ so that the term $-\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\sigma^2V$ in eq.(21) can be neglected, a non-trivial evolution of (τ^1, τ^2) occurs, because of the negativity of the term $-\hbar\alpha(\tau^2)^{3/2}f(\tau)V^{-1/2}$ in eq.(21). The choice of the solution $\sigma \equiv 0$, $V \equiv \text{const}$ is not allowed any more, as is seen from eqs.(22 - a, b).

Figures 2 - a, b, c show a typical example of the evolution of (τ^1, τ^2) , (p_1, p_2) and (V, σ) , respectively. Units, s.t. $\hbar = 1$ and $\alpha = 1$, have been chosen. We have

set the initial conditions for (τ^1, τ^2) , p_1 , σ and V . The initial condition for p_2 has been decided using the constraint equation eq.(21). We can observe the same asymptotic behavior of the system which arises irrespective of the initial conditions, due to the back-reaction: The back-reaction drives the system into the direction corresponding to a thinner torus, i.e. $\tau^2 \rightarrow 0$ while $\tau^1 \rightarrow \text{finite}$. At the same time, the 2-volume V asymptotically approaches zero. We find out that this behavior is universal by setting various generic initial conditions. This universal behavior can also be understood by investigating the qualitative characteristics of eqs.(21)-(24), which shall be done in the next sub-section.

We should also note a special class of trajectories characterized by the initial condition $\tau^1 = n/2$ (n : integer), $p_1 = 0$.^{*} The (τ^1, τ^2) -trajectory becomes parallel to the τ^2 -axis and (p_1, p_2) -trajectory is on the p_2 -axis. Depending on whether $p_2 > 0$ or $p_2 < 0$, τ^2 tends to ∞ or 0 , respectively. In any case, the shape of the torus becomes thinner and thinner as it evolves. (Note the modular invariance of the system.)

(c) The asymptotic behavior of the system

We can understand the universal behavior of the system by looking at eqs.(21)-(24), and investigating the asymptotic behavior of the system as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Key behaviors are

- (i) $V \rightarrow 0$, $\sigma \rightarrow \infty$, $\sigma V^n \rightarrow \infty$ ($n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$).
- (ii) $(\tau^2)^2(p_1^2 + p_2^2)$ increases, at least as fast as[§] $\sigma^2 V^2$.
- (iii) $\tau^2 \downarrow 0$, or $\tau^2 \rightarrow \infty$.

^{*} Because of the modular invariance of the system, the cases of $\tau^1 = \text{integer}$ are equivalent to the case of $\tau^1 = 0$, and those of $\tau^1 = \text{half integer}$ are equivalent to the case of $\tau^1 = 1/2$. The trajectories of the former cases are stable against perturbations, while the trajectories of the latter cases are unstable. This can be seen from Figures 1 – *a, b* along with eq.(17).

[§] Here, ‘ $y(t)$ increases at least as fast as $x(t)$ ’ or ‘ $y(t)$ increases at least as $x(t)$ ’ means that, $|x(t)/y(t)| \rightarrow c$, $0 \leq c < \infty$ when $t \rightarrow \infty$. In other words, $1/y(t) = O(1/x(t))$ when $t \rightarrow \infty$.

(iv) $p_1\dot{\tau}^1 + p_2\dot{\tau}^2$ increases at least as σ^2V , and $\frac{1}{(\tau^2)^2}((\dot{\tau}^1)^2 + (\dot{\tau}^2)^2)$ increases at least as σ^2 .

Now, let us derive the above results. First of all, eq.(22 – b) can be written with the help of eq.(21) as

$$\dot{\sigma} = \alpha\sigma^2 + \frac{\hbar}{2}(\tau^2)^{3/2}f(\tau)V^{-3/2} \quad . \quad (22 - b')$$

Thus, $\dot{\sigma} > 0$, so that σ always increases and becomes positive at some stage. Then, V decreases because of eq.(22 – a). Furthermore, it is easily shown that $(\sigma^2V^2)' = \hbar(\tau^2)^{3/2}f(\tau)\sigma V^{1/2} > 0$, so that the combination σ^2V^2 always increases in time. (Therefore, σ^2V increases more strongly.) Afterwards, it is easy to get (i), by induction. Next, from eq.(21), $(\tau^2)^2(p_1^2 + p_2^2)$ increases, at least in the same manner as σ^2V^2 . Thus, we get (ii). Now, from eq.(24 – b) and eq.(21),

$$\dot{p}_2 = -\frac{\alpha}{4V}\tau^2(p_1^2 + p_2^2) - \frac{3\alpha}{4\tau^2}\sigma^2V + \hbar(\tau^2)^{3/2}\frac{\partial f(\tau)}{\partial \tau^2}V^{-1/2}, \quad (24 - b')$$

so that $\dot{p}_2 < 0$ (note that $\frac{\partial f(\tau)}{\partial \tau^2} < 0$). Furthermore, $|\dot{p}_2| > \frac{3\alpha}{4\tau^2}\sigma^2V$, so that $\dot{p}_2$ decreases faster than $-\frac{\sigma^2V}{\tau^2}$. (Note that, if $\tau^2 \rightarrow \text{finite}$, this implies a strong deceleration of p_2 .) This fact excludes the behavior $\tau^2 \rightarrow \text{finite}$, for, if so, $p_2 \propto V\frac{(\tau^2)^2}{(\tau^2)^2}$ (eq.(24 – a)) should tend to zero, which contradicts with the deceleration of p_2 . Therefore, τ^2 always behaves as $\tau^2 \downarrow 0$ or $\rightarrow \infty$. Thus, we get (iii). Next, we see that $p_1\dot{\tau}^1 + p_2\dot{\tau}^2 (= \frac{\alpha(\tau^2)^2}{V}(p_1^2 + p_2^2))$ (eqs.(23 – a), (24 – a)) increases at least as σ^2V , with the help of eq.(21). Finally, $\frac{V}{(\tau^2)^2}((\dot{\tau}^1)^2 + (\dot{\tau}^2)^2) (\propto p_1\dot{\tau}^1 + p_2\dot{\tau}^2)$ increases at least as σ^2V , so that $\frac{1}{(\tau^2)^2}((\dot{\tau}^1)^2 + (\dot{\tau}^2)^2)$ increases at least as σ^2 . Thus, we get (iv).

The generic trajectories are the ones for which $\tau^1 \rightarrow \text{finite}$ and $\tau^2 \rightarrow 0$, like Figures 2 – a, b, c. We can understand this behavior as follows: Suppose that $|\dot{\tau}^1|$ is at most comparable with $|\dot{\tau}^2|$. Then, from (iv), we can make an estimation as $\frac{\dot{\tau}^2}{\tau^2} \sim -\sigma$, so that τ^2 rapidly approaches to 0 (faster than $\exp -\sigma t$ since σ is increasing). Noting that V^{-1} increases much slower than σ ((i)), the combinations of the form

$(\tau^2)^n V^{-m}$ in $(23-a, b)$ become strong suppression factors. This is compatible with the assumption that $|\dot{\tau}^1|$ is not so large compared with $|\dot{\tau}^2|$. Therefore, in $(24-b)$, only the term proportional to p_2^2 on the R.H.S. dominates and determines the gross properties of the equation, which gives rise to the universal behavior.

There is a special class of trajectories determined by the initial condition $\tau^1 = 0$ (or in general, $\tau^1 = n/2$ (integer)) and $p_1 = 0$.^{*} Due to the property of $f(\tau^1, \tau^2)$ (eq.(18)) with eqs.(23-a, b), this implies that $\tau^1 \equiv 0$ (or $\equiv n/2$), $p_1 \equiv 0$, i.e. the trajectory of (τ^1, τ^2) and (p_1, p_2) form a line-segment on (or parallel to) the τ^2 -axis and p_2 -axis, respectively. Combining (iv) with $p_1 \equiv 0$, we see that $p_2 \dot{\tau}^2$ always increases. It means that any (τ^1, τ^2) -trajectory which is parallel to the τ^2 -axis has no turning point, and that τ^2 tends to 0 or ∞ , depending on the initial condition. Furthermore, combining again (iv) with $p_1 \equiv 0$ and $\tau^1 = \text{constant}$, we see that $\frac{\dot{\tau}^2}{\tau^2} \sim \pm \sigma$, so that τ^2 approaches rapidly to ∞ or 0 (faster than $\exp \pm \sigma t$ since σ is increasing).

As is noted previously, our treatment is based on the adiabatic approximation. Thus, the results should always be taken with a caveat. In general, when instability is observed in the adiabatic treatment, it implies the unstable tendency of the system and it suggests the necessity of a further investigation beyond the adiabatic approximation, rather than just neglecting the resultant instability. Furthermore, in the present case, there are good reasons to regard the unstable behavior as a real one. First, as investigated above, the universal asymptotic behavior of the generic trajectories implies that $\dot{\tau}^1 \rightarrow 0$, $\dot{\tau}^2 \rightarrow 0$ (and $\dot{V} \sim o(\sigma)$) although $p_2 \rightarrow -\infty$. This is because $\dot{\tau}^1 \propto \frac{(\tau^2)^2 p_1}{V}$, $\dot{\tau}^2 \propto \frac{(\tau^2)^2 p_2}{V}$, and τ^2 becomes a strong suppression (stronger than $\exp \sigma t$), while $1/V$ is at most $\sim \sigma$. Thus, the adiabatic treatment for τ^1 and τ^2 becomes better and better as $\tau^2 \rightarrow 0$: $\dot{\omega}_A/\omega_A^2 \sim \dot{\lambda}_A/\lambda_A^{3/2} \sim (\tau^2)^{3/2} \cdot \frac{\dot{\tau}^2}{(\tau^2)^2} = (\tau^2)^{1/2} \cdot (\frac{\dot{\tau}^2}{\tau^2}) \rightarrow 0$ (see eq.(5)). Furthermore, $\dot{V}$ does not harm the adiabatic treatment because of the conformal invariance of the matter field, as has already been discussed previously (§§2-(b), after eq.(8)). See Figures 3-a, b, c. (On the

* The remarks for the last paragraph of §§3-b apply here, too. See the footnote there.

other hand, we should also note that the special class of trajectories characterized by $\tau^1 \equiv n/2$ (n :integer), $\tau^2 \rightarrow \infty$, is not appropriate for the adiabatic treatment: By (iv), τ^2 tends to infinity even stronger than $\exp \sigma t$. However, because of the modular invariance, the trajectories for which $\tau^1 \equiv \text{constant}$ and $\tau^2 \downarrow 0$ give the good information of the class of these trajectories.)

Another support for the present result comes from the consideration of the case of the negative cosmological constant without matter field. It is straightforward to introduce the Λ -term [24] (see eq.(16)):

$$\alpha H = \frac{\alpha^2(\tau^2)^2}{2V}(p_1^2 + p_2^2) - \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2\sigma^2V - \alpha\Lambda V = 0 \quad , \quad (21\Lambda)$$

$$\dot{V} = -\alpha\sigma V \quad , \quad (22\Lambda - a)$$

$$\dot{\sigma} = \frac{\alpha}{2}\sigma^2 + \frac{\alpha(\tau^2)^2}{2V^2}(p_1^2 + p_2^2) + \Lambda \quad , \quad (22\Lambda - b)$$

$$\dot{\tau}^1 = \frac{\alpha}{V}(\tau^2)^2 p_1 \quad , \quad (23\Lambda - a)$$

$$\dot{p}_1 = 0 \quad , \quad (23\Lambda - b)$$

$$\dot{\tau}^2 = \frac{\alpha}{V}(\tau^2)^2 p_2 \quad , \quad (24\Lambda - a)$$

$$\dot{p}_2 = -\frac{\alpha}{V}\tau^2(p_1^2 + p_2^2). \quad (24\Lambda - b)$$

Here, $-\Lambda$ corresponds to the cosmological constant ($\Lambda > 0$). Because of the negativity of the last term in eq.(21 Λ), the same kind of evolution for (τ^1, τ^2) as in the case of the matter field is observed. (It is also notable that (21 Λ)-(24 $\Lambda - b$) can be solved analytically [24].) It strongly suggests that the instability is independent of the adiabatic treatment. At the same time, we should note the essential difference between our case and the case of the negative cosmological constant. Especially, the difference between (23 - b) and (23 $\Lambda - b$) is prominent. Furthermore, $\hbar(\tau^2)^{3/2}f(\tau)V^{-3/2}$ (which corresponds to Λ comparing (21) with (21 Λ)) depends on (τ^1, τ^2) and V , which causes a highly non-trivial evolution.

4. The effective action for the modular degrees of freedom

(a) Partition function

We have treated so far the back-reaction of the quantum field on the modular degrees of freedom, in the sense that the semiclassical Einstein equation, eq.(1), has been solved, with $\langle T_{\alpha\beta} \rangle$ on the right-hand side being calculated in the background spacetime. We can handle the same problem in a more systematic manner by the path-integral approach. The significance of this investigation is as follows:

First, we know that we can derive eq.(1) formally, by taking the first variation of the phase w.r.t. $g_{\alpha\beta}$ in the in-in path-integral expression for $g_{\alpha\beta}$ and ψ [5][6][7]. However, when we discuss the semiclassical gravity in more detail, it is preferable to take into account the effects coming from the path-integral measure of $g_{\alpha\beta}$. Since we cannot fix the measure in a reasonable manner, we usually do not discuss much about this effect. Fortunately, our model is simple enough to investigate the measure to a great extent, by making use of the techniques developed in string theories [15][16].

Second, regarding this problem, we expect that the measure in the original phase space, $\int [dh_{ab} d\pi^{ab} dN dN_a]$, should reduce to the standard canonical measure in terms of the reduced phase space variables, $\int [d\tau^A dp_A] [dV d\sigma] [dN]$, after gauge-fixing, according to the general theory of the path integral for the 1st-class constrained systems [25]. Analyzing this reduction process in detail for the case of our model is highly non-trivial and helpful for deeper understanding of the path-integral approach for quantum gravity [26].

Third, furthermore, our model also becomes a test candidate for another fundamental problem: The validity of the minisuperspace approach in quantum cosmology. It is essential in our reduction procedure that the condition of $N = \text{const}$ on Σ is compatible with the equations of motion (§§3 – b). In the context of quantum cosmology, it can correspond to the minisuperspace approach: We often

impose the special form on metrics, which is compatible with the equations of motion, and quantize them within this sub-class of metrics, for tractability. Then, a fundamental question arises as to whether this approximate treatment reflects faithfully the main features of the full-quantized system. The results may depend on which space is chosen as the starting whole phase space, viz. whether we start from the full phase space (full quantization) or from its sub-space (minisuperspace quantization). In the former case, it is expected that some extra factor emerges in the measure, since in this case, the condition $N = \text{const}$ on Σ should be treated as an extra constraint, rather than just an ansatz. If so, this extra factor can have some influence on the semiclassical evolution of the system. The similar effect can arise from our assumption of the spatial homogeneity of our torus model (§§2 – a). Our model is suitable for the detailed analysis of this fundamental problem. In the present paper, however, we restrict ourselves to the treatment *à la* minisuperspace models, which itself is one consistent treatment.

Fourth, when we need to investigate validity conditions of the semiclassical treatment described by eq.(1), then, we have to study the second variation of the effective action $W[V_+, \tau_+; V_-, \tau_-]$ [7]. Thus, we need to estimate $W[V_+, \tau_+; V_-, \tau_-]$ using the in-in path-integral formalism.

We first discuss within the framework of the standard in-out path-integral formalism [8] and later generalize it to the in-in formalism. In this subsection, we shall derive the expression for the partition function Z in terms of the reduced phase space variables. In the next subsection, we shall estimate the effective action for matter, $W[V_+, \tau_+; V_-, \tau_-]$.

The partition function in our case is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \mathcal{N} \int [dh_{ab} d\pi^{ab} dN dN_a] [d\psi] \exp i \int (\pi^{ab} \dot{h}_{ab} + p_\psi \dot{\psi} - N\mathcal{H} - N_a \mathcal{H}^a) \\ &= \mathcal{N} \int [dh_{ab} d\pi^{ab} dN dN_a] \exp i \int (\pi^{ab} \dot{h}_{ab} - N\mathcal{H} - N_a \mathcal{H}^a) \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where, in the last line, we understand that the matter degrees ψ have been integrated out and suitable vacuum expectation values have appeared in $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}^a$

(e.g. $T_{\alpha\beta}n^\alpha n^\beta \rightarrow \langle T_{\alpha\beta} \rangle n^\alpha n^\beta$). (See the next subsection for more explicit discussions.)

Integrating over the multiplier N_a is equivalent to inserting $\delta(\mathcal{H}^a)$ and setting N_a to be an arbitrary value if needed.[★] Let us set $N_a = 0$:

$$Z = \mathcal{N} \int [dh_{ab} d\pi^{ab} dN] \delta(\mathcal{H}^a) \exp i \int (\pi^{ab} \dot{h}_{ab} - N\mathcal{H}) \quad . \quad (26)$$

The action is invariant under the time-reparametrization and $Diff(\Sigma)$ (the diffeomorphism on the spatial surface Σ). Now, the gauge-fixing is needed to make this expression meaningful. The gauge-fixing condition for $Diff(\Sigma)$ which is directly connected to our classical treatment in §3 is,

$$h_{ab} - V \hat{h}_{ab} = 0 \quad , \quad (27)$$

where $\hat{h}_{ab}$ is given in (2-b).

At this stage, we need to fix our general attitude for the treatment of our model. Any 2-dimensional metric h_{ab} is conformally flat [15][16], and the conformal factor V is a function of spatial coordinates (as well as a time parameter t) in general, $V = V(t, \xi^1, \xi^2)$. Here, furthermore, we set a further restriction to construct a tractable model, which we have investigated in the previous sections: we restrict the class of spatial metrics h_{ab} to the one in which V becomes spatially constant, $V = V(t)$. At the same time, the lapse function N is restricted to $N = N(t)$. Both of these ansatz are compatible with the classical equations of motion. Such restrictions on the class of the path-integral variables correspond to the minisuperspace models in quantum cosmology. (See §5 for more discussions on this point.)

The treatment for the time-reparametrization invariance is well-investigated [27]. The final result is neat: Introducing the physical time $T = \int^t dt N(t)$, one

★ This situation is parallel to the case of QED. In the latter case, the term $A_0 \text{div} \vec{E}$ appears in the action. One can set $A_0 = 0$ if needed, provided that $\delta(\text{div} \vec{E})$ is inserted in the integrand.

computes a transition amplitude from time 0 to time T . Then, integrate over the result with respect to T [27]. Here, we shall not do it explicitly, since we are mainly interested in the semiclassical evolution of the system. We understand that we follow the above procedure whenever needed.

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \mathcal{N} \int [dV dv'^a d^2\tau] [dh_{ab} d\pi^{ab} dN] \delta(h_{ab} - V \hat{h}_{ab}) \Delta_{FP} \delta((P_1^\dagger \pi)^a) \exp iS \\ &= \mathcal{N} \int [dV dv'^a d^2\tau] [d\tilde{\pi}^{ab} d\sigma] J[dN] \Delta_{FP}|_{h_{ab}=V\hat{h}_{ab}} \delta((P_1^\dagger \tilde{\pi})^a) \exp iS|_{h_{ab}=V\hat{h}_{ab}} \quad , \end{aligned}$$

where $S = \int \pi^{ab} \dot{h}_{ab} - N\mathcal{H}$. Note that $h_{ab} = V(t)\hat{h}_{ab}$ corresponds to choosing the York's time-slicing, $K = \pi^a_a/V = \text{const}$ w.r.t. the spatial coordinates [21] (see §§3 – b). Thus, only the traceless part of π^{ab} , $\tilde{\pi}^{ab} = \pi^{ab} - \frac{1}{2}\pi h^{ab} = \tilde{K}^{ab}V$, has remained in argument of the delta-function in the last line above. Accordingly, the change of the integral variables $\pi^{ab} \rightarrow (\tilde{\pi}^{ab}, \sigma)$ has been performed and J is the Jacobian factor associated with this change. Employing the method in Appendix B, J can be determined as follows: A natural diffeo-invariant inner-product^{*} for $\delta\pi^{ab}$ is $(\delta\pi, \delta\pi) = \int d^2\xi \sqrt{h} h_{ac} h_{bd} \delta\pi^{ab} \delta\pi^{cd}$. Substituting $\pi^{ab} = \tilde{\pi}^{ab} + \frac{1}{2}h^{ab}\sigma V$, we get $(\delta\pi, \delta\pi) = (\delta\tilde{\pi}, \delta\tilde{\pi}) + \frac{1}{2}V^2(\delta\sigma, \delta\sigma)$, where $(\delta\sigma, \delta\sigma) = \int d^2\xi \sqrt{h}(\delta\sigma)^2$. Thus, $1 = J \int d\tilde{\pi}^{ab} d\sigma \exp -(\delta\pi, \delta\pi)$, so that $J = V$ up to an unimportant numerical factor.

The Faddeev-Popov determinant Δ_{FP} in our case is equivalent to the Jacobian associated with the change of the integral variables from h_{ab} to $(V, v'^a, (\tau^1, \tau^2))$, where $v'^a \notin \text{Ker } P_1$. Thus, we can employ the method in Appendix B again to determine Δ_{FP} : From eq. (A1),

$$\begin{aligned} ||\delta h_{ab}||^2 &= ||\delta\phi h_{ab} + (P_1 v')_{ab} + \mathcal{T}_{Aab} \delta\tau^A||^2 \\ &= 4(\delta\phi, \delta\phi) + (v', P_1^\dagger P_1 v') + (\mathcal{T}_A, \mathcal{T}_B) \delta\tau^A \delta\tau^B \quad . \end{aligned}$$

* An appropriate power of $\alpha := l_{\text{Planck}}$ should be multiplied to formulae in order to adjust physical dimensions like eq.(A3). It is easy and not significant for the present discussions, so we omit the factor.

Then,

$$1 = \Delta_{FP} \int d\phi dv' d^2\tau \exp -||\delta h||^2 = \Delta_{FP} (det' P_1^\dagger P_1)^{-1/2} det^{-1/2}(\mathcal{T}_A, \mathcal{T}_B)$$

Thus,

$$\Delta_{FP} = (det' P_1^\dagger P_1)^{1/2} det^{1/2}(\mathcal{T}_A, \mathcal{T}_B) \quad .$$

Thus,

$$Z = Vol_{Diff_0} \mathcal{N} \int [dV d^2\tau] [d\tilde{\pi}^{ab} d\sigma] [dN] \left(\frac{det' P_1^\dagger P_1}{det(\chi^\alpha, \chi^\beta)} \right)^{1/2} det^{1/2}(\mathcal{T}_A, \mathcal{T}_B) V \delta((P_1^\dagger \tilde{\pi})^a) \exp iS|_{h_{ab}=V\hat{h}_{ab}} \quad , \quad (28)$$

where, $\{\chi^\alpha\}_{\alpha=1,2}$ is the basis for $Ker P_1$, a space of conformal Killing vectors.[★]

Let us investigate the factor $\delta((P_1^\dagger \tilde{\pi})^a)$. According to eq. (C1) in Appendix C ($A = P_1^\dagger$, $\vec{x} = \tilde{\pi}^{ab}$, $f(\vec{x}) = \exp iS$ and $\{\Psi^A\}_{A=1,2}$ are the zero-modes for $P_1^\dagger$),

$$\begin{aligned} & \int [d\tilde{\pi}^{ab}] \delta((P_1^\dagger \tilde{\pi})^a) \exp iS[h_{ab} = V\hat{h}_{ab}, \tilde{\pi}^{ab}, \sigma, N] \\ &= \int [d^2p] \frac{det^{1/2}(\Psi^A, \Psi^B)}{det' P_1^\dagger} \exp i \int dt (p_A \dot{\tau}^A + \sigma \dot{V} - N\mathcal{H}) \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Here, in the last line, the non-zero-mode components of $\tilde{\pi}^{ab}$ have been set to be zero according to the formula (C1). This is equivalent to substituting $\tilde{\pi}^{ab} = \tilde{K}^{ab}V = \sum_A p_A \Psi^{Aab}V$ into the action. Therefore, this is the path-integral version of the procedure of solving the momentum constraint in §§3 – b.

★ Any element in $Diff_0$ (diffeomorphism on Σ homotopic to 1) is associated with a vector v^a , which can be decomposed as $v^a = v'^a + \lambda_\alpha \chi^\alpha$, where $v'^a \notin Ker P_1$. Noting the argument in Appendix A, $\int [dv^a] = \int [dv'^a] d^2\lambda det^{1/2}(\chi^\alpha, \chi^\beta)$, which means $Vol_{Diff_0} = (\int [dv'^a]) \cdot Vol_{Ker P_1}$. Thus, by factorizing $(\int [dv'^a]) = Vol_{Diff_0}/Vol_{Ker P_1}$ from the path-integral, the factor $det^{-1/2}(\chi^\alpha, \chi^\beta)$ appears. Here, the factor $(\int d^2\lambda)^{-1}$ is absorbed into the normalization $\mathcal{N}$.

Thus,

$$Z = \mathcal{N} \int [d\tau^A dp_A] [dV d\sigma] [dN] \frac{det'^{1/2} P_1^\dagger P_1}{det'^{1/2} P_1 P_1^\dagger} \cdot \frac{det^{1/2}(\mathcal{T}_A, \mathcal{T}_B)}{det^{1/2}(\chi^\alpha, \chi^\beta)} \cdot det^{1/2}(\Psi^A, \Psi^B) \times \\ \times \exp i \int dt (p_A \dot{\tau}^A + \sigma \dot{V} - N\mathcal{H}) \quad . \quad (30)$$

Here, $det' P_1^\dagger = (det' P_1 P_1^\dagger)^{1/2}$ has been used.*

Now, we choose $\{\mathcal{T}_A\}_{A=1,2}$ and $\{\Psi^A\}_{A=1,2}$ as $(\mathcal{T}_A, \Psi^B) = \delta_A^B$ (see §§3 – b), so that $det^{1/2}(\mathcal{T}_A, \mathcal{T}_B) det^{1/2}(\Psi^A, \Psi^B) = 1$. For our case of a locally flat torus, $\{\chi^\alpha\}_{\alpha=1,2}$ can be chosen as $\chi_a^1 = (1, 0)$ and $\chi_a^2 = (0, 1)$, without inducing any critical point as vector fields. Then, $det^{1/2}(\chi^\alpha, \chi^\beta) = 1$.

Finally, $det'^{1/2} P_1^\dagger P_1$ and $det'^{1/2} P_1 P_1^\dagger$ should be estimated. The map P_1 is a map from a space of 2-vector fields to a space of 2nd rank, symmetric and traceless tensor fields, and the map $P_1^\dagger$ is a map from the latter space to the former space. Note that each of the spaces can be represented as a 2-component vector fields. Now, it is convenient to use the complex coordinates $(z, \bar{z})$, with respect to which both P_1 and $P_1^\dagger$ become diagonal [15]. Let $z = x + iy$, $\bar{z} = x - iy$. Then, the line element becomes ($e^\phi := V$), $ds^2 = e^\phi \hat{h}_{ab} d\xi^1 d\xi^2 = e^\phi (dx^2 + dy^2) = e^\phi dz d\bar{z}$, so that $h_{ab} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2}e^\phi \\ \frac{1}{2}e^\phi & 0 \end{pmatrix}_{(z, \bar{z})}$. (The suffix $(z, \bar{z})$ is for the explicit indication of the coordinates employed.)[§] The following arguments are valid for a general spatial

* This equality can be shown by estimating an integral $I = \int dw'^{ab} \exp -(P_1^\dagger w', P_1^\dagger w')$ in two different manners (here, w'^{ab} is symmetric, traceless and $\notin Ker P_1^\dagger$): One way is $I = \int dw' \exp -(w', P_1 P_1^\dagger w') = (det' P_1 P_1^\dagger)^{-1/2}$, and the other way is $I = \int d(P_1^\dagger w') (det' P_1^\dagger)^{-1} \exp -(P_1^\dagger w', P_1^\dagger w') = (det' P_1^\dagger)^{-1}$. This change of the integral variables in the latter estimation is valid since the space of the original variables (w'^{ab}) is isomorphic as a vector space to the space of the new variables $((P_1^\dagger w')^a)$ by the map $P_1^\dagger$. See below.

§ We shall use the following facts: $\partial := \partial_z = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_x - i\partial_y)$ and $\bar{\partial} := \partial_{\bar{z}} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_x + i\partial_y)$; $\vec{v} = (v^1, v^2)_{(x,y)} = (v^1 + iv^2, v^1 - iv^2)_{(z, \bar{z})}$, i.e. $v^z = v^1 + iv^2$, $v^{\bar{z}} = v^1 - iv^2 = \overline{v^z}$ ($v^1, v^2 \in \mathbf{R}$); Let T^{ab} be symmetric and traceless, and let its components in (x, y) -coordinates, T^{11} etc., are real, then $(T^{ab})_{(z, \bar{z})} = diag(2(T^{11} + iT^{12}), 2(T^{11} - iT^{12}))$, i.e. $T^{zz} = 2(T^{11} + iT^{12})$, $T^{\bar{z}\bar{z}} = 2(T^{11} - iT^{12}) = \overline{T^{zz}}$ and the other components vanish; The Christoffel symbols become $\Gamma_{zz}^z = \partial\phi$, $\Gamma_{\bar{z}\bar{z}}^{\bar{z}} = \bar{\partial}\phi = \overline{\Gamma_{zz}^z}$ and the others vanish.

metric h_{ab} on a torus, so that we shall discuss in general terms. Only at the final stage (eq.(34) below), we set the condition that $\phi = \ln V =$ spatially constant.

Now, both P_1 and $P_1^\dagger$ can be regarded as a map from a 2-component field to another 2-component field:

$P_1 : {}^t(v^z, v^{\bar{z}}) \mapsto {}^t((P_1 v)^{zz}, (P_1 v)^{\bar{z}\bar{z}})$, $P_1^\dagger : {}^t(w^{zz}, w^{\bar{z}\bar{z}}) \mapsto {}^t((P_1^\dagger w)^z, (P_1^\dagger w)^{\bar{z}})$, where w^{ab} is a symmetric, traceless tensor field and ${}^t(\cdot, \cdot)$ indicates the transposition. In this sense, P_1 and $P_1^\dagger$ are represented as

$$P_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 4e^{-\phi}\bar{\partial} & 0 \\ 0 & 4e^{-\phi}\partial \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_1^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} -2e^{-2\phi}\partial e^{2\phi} & 0 \\ 0 & -2e^{-2\phi}\bar{\partial} e^{2\phi} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (31)$$

Thus, $P_1^\dagger P_1 : {}^t(v^z, v^{\bar{z}}) \mapsto {}^t((P_1^\dagger P_1 v)^z, (P_1^\dagger P_1 v)^{\bar{z}})$ is represented as

$$P_1^\dagger P_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -8e^{-2\phi}\partial e^{\phi}\bar{\partial} & 0 \\ 0 & -8e^{-2\phi}\bar{\partial} e^{\phi}\partial \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2\Delta + {}^{(2)}R & 0 \\ 0 & 2\Delta + {}^{(2)}R \end{pmatrix}, \quad (32)$$

where $\Delta = -D_a D^a$ and ${}^{(2)}R$ are the Laplacian and the scalar curvature, respectively, defined by the covariant derivative (D_a) w.r.t. $e^{\phi}\hat{h}_{ab}$. Similarly, $P_1 P_1^\dagger : {}^t(w^{zz}, w^{\bar{z}\bar{z}}) \mapsto {}^t((P_1 P_1^\dagger w)^{zz}, (P_1 P_1^\dagger w)^{\bar{z}\bar{z}})$ is represented as

$$P_1 P_1^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} -8e^{-\phi}\bar{\partial} e^{-2\phi}\partial & 0 \\ 0 & -8e^{-\phi}\partial e^{-2\phi}\bar{\partial} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 2\Delta - 2 {}^{(2)}R & 0 \\ 0 & 2\Delta - 2 {}^{(2)}R \end{pmatrix}. \quad (33)$$

Therefore,

$$\det'^{1/2} P_1^\dagger P_1 = \det'(2\Delta + {}^{(2)}R), \quad \det'^{1/2} P_1 P_1^\dagger = \det'(2\Delta - 2 {}^{(2)}R).$$

In our model of locally flat tori ($\phi = \ln V =$ spatially constant), thus,

$$\det'^{1/2} P_1^\dagger P_1 = \det'^{1/2} P_1 P_1^\dagger = \det'(2\Delta).$$

Finally, we obtain

$$Z = \mathcal{N} \int [d\tau^A dp_A] [dV d\sigma] [dN] \exp i \int (p_A \dot{\tau}^A + \sigma \dot{V} - N\mathcal{H}) \quad . \quad (34)$$

The integral region for τ^1, τ^2 should be understood as on the moduli space, $\mathcal{M}_{g=1}$: As is indicated in eq.(28), $Diff_0(\Sigma)$ (the diffeomorphism group on Σ homotopic to 1) has been factorized from the path-integral. What is really needed to be factorized is the whole diffeomorphism group on Σ , $Diff(\Sigma)$. Note that [15][16]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_g &\simeq Riem(\Sigma)/Weyl \times Diff(\Sigma) \simeq (Riem(\Sigma)/Weyl \times Diff_0(\Sigma)) / MCG \\ &\simeq H_+/PSL(2, \mathbf{Z}) \simeq D(H_+)/\sim \quad . \end{aligned}$$

Here, $MCG := Diff(\Sigma)/Diff_0(\Sigma)$ is the mapping-class group for Σ , and $MCG \simeq PSL(2, \mathbf{Z})$ for $\Sigma \simeq T^2$ (i.e. a group of 2×2 unimodular matrix with integer elements, modulo sign). $D(H_+)$ is the fundamental region in H_+ (upper half-plane) w.r.t. the action of $PSL(2, \mathbf{Z})$ (e.g. the Dirichlet region $D = \{z \in H_+ | |Rez| \leq 1/2, |z| \geq 1\}$) and $/\sim$ indicates the identification $(\tau^1, \tau^2) \sim -(\tau^1, \tau^2)$ on the boundary of D [15][16]. Thus, the integral region for (τ^1, τ^2) in eq.(34) should be understood as over $\mathcal{M}_{g=1}$ rather than over H_+ , considering that we have factorized the volume of the mapping-class group $MCG \simeq PSL(2, \mathbf{Z})$ as well as $Diff_0(\Sigma)$ from the path-integral.

If we integrate out the momenta p_A and σ in eq.(34), we get

$$\begin{aligned} Z = \mathcal{N} \int \left[\frac{d\tau^A}{(\tau^2)^2} \right] \left[\frac{dV}{\sqrt{V}} \right] [dN] \exp i \int dt N(t) \{ &\frac{V}{2\alpha(\tau^2)^2} \frac{1}{N^2} ((\dot{\tau}^1)^2 + (\dot{\tau}^2)^2) \\ &- \frac{1}{2\alpha N^2 V} \dot{V}^2 + \hbar(\tau^2)^{3/2} f(\tau) V^{-1/2} \} \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Note that the kinetic term for (τ^1, τ^2) in the action is proportional to $\mathcal{G}_{AB} \dot{\tau}^A \dot{\tau}^B$ and the last term in the action is proportional to the non-holomorphic Eisenstein series $G(\tau, 3/2)$ (see below eq.(18)). Thus, Z is modular invariant since both the measure $\frac{d^2\tau}{(\tau^2)^2}$ and the action are modular invariant.

(b) Estimation of the functional determinant for the matter

Now, we estimate the path-integral for the matter ψ in eq.(25). Our aim is to obtain the effective action of the form $W[\phi, \tau^1(\cdot), \tau^2(\cdot)]$ by integrating out quantum fluctuations of the matter. Generalizing the framework to the in-in formalism and getting $W[\phi_+, \tau_+; \phi_-, \tau_-]$, one can discuss the validity conditions for the semiclassical treatment [7], eq.(1). At this stage, the peculiarity of the system including gravity is prominent. In the standard treatment of a dissipative system, like a quantum Brownian motion [17], the interaction between the sub-system and the environment is described by a weak, linear coupling. In our case, however, there is no such interaction term between gravity (analogous to the sub-system) and matter (analogous to the environment). Rather, the interaction is bilinear in ψ and non-linear in (τ^1, τ^2) and ϕ , as is seen from eq.(7). Thus, it requires a new treatment for a deeper analysis. Here, we should be content with only a rough estimation of the effect of the nonlinear coupling. We want to estimate the partition function for the matter,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_\psi &= \int [d\psi] \exp -\frac{1}{2\hbar} \int \psi(-\tilde{\partial}^2 + \frac{1}{8}\bar{R})\psi\sqrt{\bar{g}} = Det^{-1/2}\{\frac{V}{2\pi\hbar}(-\tilde{\partial}^2 + \frac{1}{8}\bar{R})\} \\ &= \exp -\frac{1}{\hbar}\tilde{W}[\tau(\cdot)] \quad . \end{aligned}$$

Here, “ $\tilde{\cdot}$ ” denotes the Riemannian signature quantity. We calculate using the metric $\bar{g}_{\alpha\beta} = (1, V\hat{h}_{ab})$ with eq.(2-b). It is difficult to estimate the above functional determinant exactly for a general function $(\tau^1(\cdot), \tau^2(\cdot))$ and $V(\cdot)$. From the viewpoint of the quantum dissipative system, this difficulty comes from the peculiarity of the interaction between gravity and matter. As discussed in the beginning of §2-b, we treat the back-reaction problem in the sense that we investigate the modification of the background geometry due to matter, i.e. due to $\langle T_{\alpha\beta} \rangle$ calculated on the background spacetime. We have chosen as a background, a flat spacetime. Thus, for the lowest order approximation, we treat τ^1, τ^2 and V as constants, so that we can set $\bar{R} = 0$. This treatment corresponds to the lowest order

estimation of the functional form of the effective potential in standard quantum field theory [28].

Thus, we need to estimate the determinant of the operator

$$\hat{A} := -\frac{\alpha^2 V}{2\pi\hbar} \tilde{\partial}^2 = -\frac{\alpha^2 V}{2\pi\hbar} (\partial_0^2 + V^{-1} \hat{h}^{ab} \partial_a \partial_b) \quad ,$$

where $\hbar$ and α^2 have been inserted for the convenience of recovering a formula for pseudo-Riemannian signature. Now, we need to solve the heat equation [28],

$$\begin{cases} \hat{A}\rho = -\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\rho \quad , \\ \lim_{s \downarrow 0} \rho(x, y, s) = \delta^{(3)}(x - y) \quad . \end{cases}$$

Here, $x := (x^0 = t, \xi^1, \xi^2)$. Taking care of the periodicity in space, the solution is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(x, x', s) &= \left(\frac{\hbar}{2\alpha^2 V s} \right)^{3/2} \times \\ &\times \sum_{n_1, n_2} \exp -\frac{\pi\hbar}{2\alpha^2 V s} \{ (x^0 - x'^0)^2 + V \hat{h}_{ab} (\xi - \xi' + n)^a (\xi - \xi' + n)^b \}, \end{aligned}$$

especially,

$$\rho(x, x, s) = \left(\frac{\hbar}{2\alpha^2 V s} \right)^{3/2} \sum_{n_1, n_2} \exp -\frac{\pi\hbar}{2\alpha^2 s} (n, n) \quad ,$$

where $(n, n) := \hat{h}_{ab} n^a n^b = \frac{1}{\tau^2} (n_1^2 + 2\tau^1 n_1 n_2 + |\tau|^2 n_2^2)$. Thus, the ζ -function associated with $\hat{A}$ is [27],

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_A(z) &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(z)} \int_0^\infty ds s^{z-1} \text{Tr} \rho(s) \\ &= \frac{\Omega}{\Gamma(z)} \sum_{n_1 n_2} \int_0^\infty ds s^{z-1} \left(\frac{\hbar}{2\alpha^2 V s} \right)^{3/2} \exp -\frac{\pi\hbar}{2\alpha^2 s} (n, n) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \left(\frac{\hbar}{2\alpha^2 V} \right)^{3/2} \Omega \frac{z\Gamma(\frac{3}{2}-z)}{\Gamma(z+1)} \sum_{n_1 n_2} \left(\frac{\pi\hbar}{2\alpha^2} (n, n) \right)^{z-3/2}, \quad (36)$$

where $\Omega = \int d^3x \sqrt{g}$ and a transformation of variable s ($x := \frac{\pi\hbar}{2\alpha^2} (n, n) s^{-1}$) has been done to get the formula in the last line from the middle line. Noting that $\frac{d}{dz}|_{z=0} \left(\frac{z\Gamma(\frac{3}{2}-z)}{\Gamma(z+1)} C^{z-l} \right) = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} C^{-l}$ for $\forall C$ when C is independent of z , we get

$$\zeta'_A(0) = \frac{\Omega}{2\pi\alpha^3 V^{3/2}} \sum'_{n_1 n_2} (n, n)^{-3/2}.$$

Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{W} &= \frac{\hbar}{2} \ln \text{Det} \hat{A} = -\frac{\hbar}{2} \zeta'_A(0) \\ &= -\frac{\hbar\Omega}{4\pi\alpha^3 V^{3/2}} (\tau^2)^{3/2} \sum'_{n_1 n_2} \frac{1}{(n_1^2 + 2\tau^1 n_1 n_2 + |\tau|^2 n_2^2)^{3/2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (37-a)$$

To recover W for the pseudo-Riemannian signature, we replace $\hbar \rightarrow i\hbar$, $\alpha \rightarrow i\alpha$ (no change in Ω , $d\bar{x}^0 dx^1 dx^2 dx^3 \leftrightarrow dx^0 dx^1 dx^2 dx^3$). This replacement comes from the comparison between $W = i\frac{\hbar}{2} \ln \text{Det} \left(\frac{i\alpha^2}{2\pi\hbar} (-\partial^2) \right)$ and $\tilde{W} = \frac{\hbar}{2} \ln \text{Det} \left(\frac{\alpha^2}{2\pi\hbar} (-\tilde{\partial}^2) \right)$. Thus,

$$W[\tau^1, \tau^2] = \frac{\hbar\Omega}{4\pi\alpha^3 V^{3/2}} (\tau^2)^{3/2} \sum'_{n_1 n_2} \frac{1}{(n_1^2 + 2\tau^1 n_1 n_2 + |\tau|^2 n_2^2)^{3/2}}. \quad (37-b)$$

Since we have used the expectation value of the energy-momentum tensor for the matter, $\langle T_{\alpha\beta} \rangle$, to couple with gravity (eq.(13-b) or eq.(16)), we need to use the in-in path-integral formalism, rather than the standard in-out formalism [5][6][7]. Then the matter part of the action (pseudo-Riemannian) (see eq.(7)) should be reinterpreted as,

$$\begin{aligned} S_\psi &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_c (\bar{g}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha \psi \partial_\beta \psi + \frac{1}{8} \bar{R} \psi^2) \sqrt{-\bar{g}} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \int_+ (\bar{g}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha \psi \partial_\beta \psi + \frac{1}{8} \bar{R} \psi^2) \sqrt{-\bar{g}} + \frac{1}{2} \int_- (\bar{g}^{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha \psi \partial_\beta \psi + \frac{1}{8} \bar{R} \psi^2) \sqrt{-\bar{g}}, \end{aligned}$$

where “ c ” stands for the closed-time contour and “ $+$ ” and “ $-$ ” stand for,

respectively, the $+$ -branch and the $-$ -branch of the time-contour. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
S_\psi &= \int_+ \sqrt{-\bar{g}_+} \psi \frac{1}{2\hbar} (\partial^2 - \frac{1}{8} \bar{R}) \psi - \int_- \sqrt{-\bar{g}_-} \psi \frac{1}{2\hbar} (\partial^2 - \frac{1}{8} \bar{R}) \psi \\
&= \int (\psi_+ \ \psi_-) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2\hbar} (\partial_+^2 - \frac{1}{8} \bar{R}) \sqrt{-\bar{g}_+} & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2\hbar} (\partial_-^2 - \frac{1}{8} \bar{R}) \sqrt{-\bar{g}_-} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_+ \\ \psi_- \end{pmatrix} .
\end{aligned}$$

Since $+$ and $-$ components are separated completely, it is enough to look at only the $+$ -sector (or $-$ -sector).

Now, let us investigate the effective action, $S[\tau^1, \tau^2, V; N] = S_g[\tau^1, \tau^2, V; N] + W[\tau^1, \tau^2, V; N]$, where $S_g[\phi, \tau^1, \tau^2; N]$ is the reduced action for gravity in terms of the configuration variables and $W[\tau^1, \tau^2, V; N]$ is given by eq.(37 – b). The effective action $S[\tau^1, \tau^2, V; N]$ is what has appeared in the exponent in eq.(35). It should be noted that the first variations of $S[\phi, \tau^1, \tau^2]$ w.r.t. N , V and (τ^1, τ^2) reproduce exactly eqs.(21 – 24). This result shows the following two points.

First, our approximation for the estimation of $Det^{-1/2} \left(\frac{1}{\hbar} (-\tilde{\partial}^2 + \frac{1}{8} \bar{R}) \right)$, treating τ^1, τ^2 and V as if they were constants so that $\bar{R} = 0$, corresponds to the approximation used to solve the semiclassical Einstein equation, eq.(1). Namely, $\langle T_{\alpha\beta} \rangle$, calculated on a flat background, is used in eq.(1) to estimate the deviation from the original background geometry. As is discussed at the beginning of §§2 – b, the latter approximation has been implemented for the tractability of the problem, at the expense of the self-consistency of eq.(1). Such an approximation is what is usually meant by the term “back-reaction”, and this may be the best we can do in practice.

Second, regarding the path integral expressions in the Lagrangian formalism, like eq.(35): We can reproduce eq.(1) (or equivalently, eqs.(22-24)) from the phase part $S_g + W$ in the partition function Z with the matter part integrated, and without taking care of the contributions from the measure for V and (τ^1, τ^2) (see eq.(35)). However, we now know explicitly the non-trivial path-integral measure for V and (τ^1, τ^2) as is shown in eq.(35). There should be $O(\hbar)$ correction to eq.(1)

coming from the path-integral measure for $g_{\alpha\beta}$ and this correction will cause a non-trivial correction to the dynamics of $g_{\alpha\beta}$. We shall come back to this point in the next section.

5. Discussions

In this paper, we have investigated the semiclassical dynamics of the topological degrees of freedom, (τ^1, τ^2) , which has been seldom discussed so far. By reducing the spacetime dimension to 3, we could concentrate on the study of a finite number of topological modes and we could describe the back-reaction effect from matter to topological modes, explicitly. We observed a non-trivial dynamics caused by the back-reaction. The back-reaction makes the toroidal universe unstable: The shape of the torus becomes thinner and thinner, while its total 2-volume becomes smaller and smaller. These are universal behaviors of the system independent of the initial conditions, which is justified by the asymptotic analysis of the set of dynamical equations. This observation implies the importance of the investigation of topological aspects for a deeper understanding of quantum gravity. Moreover, we could fix the path-integral measure for (τ^1, τ^2) and V and observe that the partition function is expressed in terms of the canonical variables for the reduced phase space with the standard Liouville measure.

Let us note a few points regarding the path-integral measure.

We obtained the path-integral expression on the reduced phase space with the Liouville measure (eq.(34)), while the path integral on the configuration space requires a non-trivial measure (eq.(35)). Indeed, the combination $\frac{d\tau^A}{(\tau^2)^2}$ is essential to make the partition function modular invariant. In our model, the semiclassical Einstein equation, eq.(1), corresponds to eqs.(21) – (24), and they are derived from the variation of the exponent in eq.(34) or eq.(35). It means that, from the viewpoint of the Lagrangian formalism, the semiclassical Einstein equation is derived from the variation of the phase part in the partition function, with the measure factor untouched. Thus, the measure factor gives the $O(\hbar)$ -correction

to eq.(1). In our model, the term $\int dt N(t) \hbar (2 \ln \tau^2 + 1/2 \ln V)$ can be added to the action as a correction. (Note the time reparametrization invariance implied in eq.(34).) Then, it is a non-trivial question worth while to investigate which is better as the semiclassical description, the semiclassical Einstein equation in terms of the canonical variables (eqs.(21)-(24) in our case), or the same in terms of the configuration variables with suitable corrections originating from the measure. If we perform the path integral exactly, both the canonical and the Lagrangian formalisms will give equivalent results, but they will not be equivalent within the accuracy of the semiclassical approximation.

Another important problem is linked with the validity of the minisuperspace treatment. We have investigated the homogeneous model, which is equivalent to assuming $N = N(t)$, $V = V(t)$ (see the discussion in §§4 – a, below eq.(27)). We can set this ansatz since it is compatible with the dynamics. This treatment corresponds to the minisuperspace approach in quantum cosmology. Though such a treatment is completely self-consistent, it is important to question to what extent such a treatment reflects the original full quantum theory faithfully. From the viewpoint of the original full system, the restrictions are regarded as extra constraints on the phase space. These constraints can modify the path integral measure for the reduced variables (minisuperspace variables). Since this problem is a fundamental one, it should be investigated separately. Our model may be a good test candidate to investigate this point in detail.

Acknowledgements: The author thanks R. Balasubramanian, T. Ghosh, S.D. Mohanty and V. Sahni for helpful discussions. This work has been financially supported in part by the Honda Fellowship of the Japan Association for Mathematical Sciences, and the Yukawa Memorial Foundation, Japan.

APPENDIX

A. Brief summary on the moduli space

We give here a concise summary on the moduli space just for fixing the terminology and notations used in §3 and §4. See e.g. [15], [16] for more detailed information.

Let Σ be a 2-dimensional, compact, closed, orientable manifold with genus g . The moduli space $\mathcal{M}_g$ of Σ is defined as $\mathcal{M}_g \simeq Riem(\Sigma)/Weyl \times Diff(\Sigma)$, where $Riem(\Sigma)$ is a space of all Riemannian metrics on Σ , $Weyl$ is for the Weyl group and $Diff(\Sigma)$ is for the diffeomorphism group on Σ . The universal covering space of $\mathcal{M}_g$ is called the Teichmüller space. Now, the tangent space of $\mathcal{M}_g$, $T(\mathcal{M}_g)$, can be investigated as follows: Any variation of the spatial metric $\delta h_{ab} \in T(Riem(\Sigma))$, can be decomposed into the trace part and the traceless part, the latter is furthermore decomposed into the diffeomorphism $\delta_D h_{ab}$, and the moduli deformation $\delta_M h_{ab}$;

$$\begin{aligned}\delta h_{ab} &= \delta_W h_{ab} + \delta_D h_{ab} + \delta_M h_{ab} \\ &= \delta_W h_{ab} + (P_1 v)_{ab} + \mathcal{T}_{Aab} \delta \tau^A \quad ,\end{aligned}\tag{A1}$$

where

$$\delta_W h_{ab} = \delta \phi h_{ab} \quad \text{for} \quad \exists \delta \phi \quad ,\tag{A2-a}$$

$$(P_1 v)_{ab} = D_a v_b + D_b v_a - D_c v^c h_{ab} \quad \text{for} \quad \exists v^a \quad ,\tag{A2-b}$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{Aab} = \frac{\partial h_{ab}}{\partial \tau^A} - \frac{1}{2} h^{cd} \frac{\partial h_{cd}}{\partial \tau^A} h_{ab} \quad .\tag{A2-c}$$

Here $\{\tau^A\}_{A=1, \dots, \dim_{\mathbf{R}} \mathcal{M}_g}$ are the Teichmüller parameters specifying a point in $\mathcal{M}_g$.

A natural inner-product on $T(Riem(\Sigma))$ is introduced as

$$(A, B) := \frac{1}{\alpha^2} \int_{\Sigma} d^2 x \sqrt{h} h^{ac} h^{bd} A_{ab} B_{cd} \quad \text{for} \quad \forall A_{ab}, \forall B_{ab} \in T(Riem(\Sigma)) \quad ,\tag{A3}$$

where α is the Planck length, inserted to adjust the physical dimension. Then, the tangent space of the moduli space, $T(\mathcal{M}_g)$, can be characterized by the set of all

symmetric, traceless (covariant) tensors which are perpendicular to $T(Diff(\Sigma))$ w.r.t. the inner-product (A3), the latter condition being equivalent to the condition

$$(P_1^\dagger w)^a = -2D_b w^{ab} = 0 \quad , \quad (A4)$$

for $w \in T^*(\mathcal{M}_g)$. Thus, $\dim_{\mathbf{R}} \mathcal{M}_g = \dim_{\mathbf{R}} T^*(\mathcal{M}_g) = \dim_{\mathbf{R}} Ker P_1^\dagger$, which is known as $= 0$, $= 2$, and $= 6g - 6$ for $g = 0$, $g = 1$, and $g \geq 2$, respectively. It is also known that $\dim_{\mathbf{R}} Ker P_1 - \dim_{\mathbf{R}} Ker P_1^\dagger = 6 - 6g$ (Riemann-Roch theorem). For the case of a torus ($g = 1$), then, $\dim_{\mathbf{R}} \mathcal{M} = 2$ and $\dim_{\mathbf{R}} Ker P_1 = 2$. Thus, two Teichmüller parameters (τ^1, τ^2) are needed to describe the modular deformations $\delta_M h_{ab} \in T(\mathcal{M}_{g=1})$, and two independent vectors $\{\chi^\alpha\}_{\alpha=1,2}$ are needed as the basis of $Ker P_1$.

Let $\{\mathcal{T}_{Aab}\}_{A=1,2,\dots,\dim_{\mathbf{R}} \mathcal{M}_g}$ be the basis of $T(\mathcal{M}_g)$, and $\{\Psi^{Aab}\}_{A=1,2,\dots,\dim_{\mathbf{R}} \mathcal{M}_g}$ be the basis of $T^*(\mathcal{M}_g)$. They can be chosen to satisfy $(\Psi^A, \mathcal{T}_B) = \delta^A_B$. Then, they define a metric on $\mathcal{M}_{g=1}$ (the Weil-Peterson metric), induced from the inner-product eq.(A3) on $T(Riem(\Sigma))$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_{AB} &= (\mathcal{T}_A, \mathcal{T}_B) \quad , \\ \mathcal{G}^{AB} &= (\Psi^A, \Psi^B) = \text{inverse matrix of } \mathcal{G}_{AB} \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (A5)$$

B. The Jacobian associated with a change of integral variables.

Let us note a convenient method to specify the Jacobian associated with a change of integral variables.(See e.g. [15].)

If a line element ds is given on a space of integral variables $(X^A, A = 1, 2, \dots, n)$ as $ds^2 = G_{AB} dX^A dX^B =: (dX, dX)$, then $d^n X \sqrt{\det G}$ is a natural integral measure, where $\sqrt{\det G}$ takes care of the Jacobian factor. Suppose we change the variables from X^A to $X^{A'}$, then $d^n X' \sqrt{\det G'}$ is the corresponding integral measure for the new variables. Now, a convenient way to find out the expression for $\sqrt{\det G'}$ is

- 1) Express δX^A in terms of $\delta X^{A'}$, $\delta X^A = \frac{\partial X^A}{\partial X^{A'}} \delta X^{A'}$.

- 2) Then express $(\delta X, \delta X)$ in terms of $\delta X'$, $(\delta X, \delta X) = \frac{\partial X^A}{\partial X^{A'}} \frac{\partial X^B}{\partial X^{B'}} (\delta X^{A'}, \delta X^{B'})$.
(This should be equivalent to $G_{A'B'} \delta X^{A'} \delta X^{B'}$.)
- 3) Then determine the Jacobian J by setting $1 = J \int d^n \delta X' \exp -(\delta X, \delta X)$,
since this should be equivalent to $1 = J(\det G'/\pi)^{-1/2}$. (The factor π is
usually unimportant and omitted.)

C. A formula for the delta-function.

Let us derive a formula which modifies an integral including $\delta(A\vec{x})$ into a more practical form. Here, A is a linear operator possibly with zero-modes.

Let us consider an integral, $I = \int d\vec{x} \delta(A\vec{x}) f(\vec{x})$. Let $\{\Psi^A\}$ ($A = 1, 2, \dots, m = \dim \text{Ker} A$) be the zero-modes for A . Then, any element $\vec{x}$ of a vector space $\mathcal{V}$ can be decomposed as $\vec{x} = \vec{X} + \sum_A p_A \vec{\Psi}^A$, where $\vec{X} \in \mathcal{V}/\text{Ker} A$. Now we change the integral variables from $\vec{x}$ to $(\vec{X}, p_A)$. Then, $(\vec{x}, \vec{x}) = (\vec{X}, \vec{X}) + (\vec{\Psi}^A, \vec{\Psi}^B) p_A p_B$, where $(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a suitable inner-product, which is assumed to be given. Thus, according to Appendix B, the associated Jacobian J becomes $J = \det^{1/2}(\Psi^A, \Psi^B)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \int d\vec{X} d\vec{p} \det^{1/2}(\Psi^A, \Psi^B) \delta(A\vec{X}) f(\vec{X}, \vec{p}) \\ &= \int d\vec{p} \det^{1/2}(\Psi^A, \Psi^B) (\det' A)^{-1} f(\vec{X} = \vec{0}, \vec{p}) \quad , \end{aligned}$$

where an equality, $\delta(A\vec{X}) = (\det' A)^{-1} \delta(\vec{X})$ when $\vec{X} \in \mathcal{V}/\text{Ker} A$, has been used in the last line. (This equality can be shown easily by the variable change from $\vec{X}$ to $\vec{Y} = A\vec{X}$). Therefore, we have obtained a formula

$$\int d\vec{x} \delta(A\vec{x}) f(\vec{x}) = \int d\vec{p} \det^{1/2}(\Psi^A, \Psi^B) (\det' A)^{-1} f(\vec{X} = \vec{0}, \vec{p}) \quad . \quad (C1)$$

REFERENCES

1. See e.g., J.A. Wheeler, Ann. Phys. **2** (1957), 604; R.P. Geroch, J. Math. Phys. **8** (1967), 782; R.D. Sorkin, Phys. Rev. **D33** (1986), 978; M. Visser, Phys. Rev. **D41** (1990), 1116; G.W. Gibbons and J.B. Hartle, Phys. Rev. **D42** (1990), 2458.
2. N.D. Birrell and P.C.W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space* (Cambridge University Press, 1982).
3. S.A. Fulling, *Aspects of Quantum Field Theory in Curved Space-Time* (Cambridge University Press, 1989).
4. See e.g., T. Padmanabhan and T.P. Singh, Ann. Phys. **221** (1992), 217.
5. R.D. Jordan, Phys. Rev. **D33** (1986), 444.
6. E. Calzetta and B.L. Hu, Phys. Rev. **D28** (1987), 495.
7. M. Seriu and T.P. Singh, Phys. Rev. **D50** (1994), 6165.
8. J. Schwinger, J. Math. Phys. **2** (1961), 407.
9. L.H. Ford, Ann. Phys. **144** (1982), 238.
10. T.P. Singh and T. Padmanabhan, Ann. Phys. **196** (1989), 296.
11. E. Martinec, Phys. Rev. **D30** (1984), 1198.
12. V. Moncrief, J. Math. Phys. **30** (1989), 2907.
13. A. Hosoya and K. Nakao, Prog. Theo. Phys. **84** (1990), 739.
14. M. Seriu, Phys. Lett. **B319** (1993), 74.
15. B. Hatfield, *Quantum Field Theory of Point Particles and Strings* (Addison-Wesley, 1992).
16. D. Lüst and S. Theisen, *Lectures on String Theory* (Springer-Verlag, 1989).
17. A.O. Caldeira and A.J. Leggett, Physica **121A** (1983), 587.

18. See e.g., I. Chavel, *Eigenvalues in Riemannian Geometry* (Academic Press 1984), Chapter *XI* – 2.
19. For a systematic investigation of the Casimir energy including more general cases, see J.S. Dowker, J. Math. Phys. **28** (1987), 33; Phys. Rev. **D40** (1989), 1938.
20. R.M. Wald, *General Relativity* (University of Chicago Press, 1984).
21. J.W. York, J. Math. Phys. **14** (1973), 456.
22. D. Zagier, in M. Waldschmidt, P. Moussa, J.-M. Luck and C. Itzykson (Ed.), *From Number Theory to Physics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1992.
23. R. Abraham, J.E. Marsden, T. Ratiu, *Manifolds, Tensor Analysis, and Applications* (2nd ed.) Springer-Verlag, 1988.
24. Y. Fujiwara and J. Soda, Prog.Theo.Phys. **83** (1990), 733; K. Ezawa, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994), 5211; S. Carlip and J.E. Nelson, gr-qc/9411031.
25. M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, *Quantization of Gauge Systems*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1992, Chapter 16.
26. The same problem is analysed for the case of $g \geq 2$ in S. Carlip, Class. Quantum Grav. **12** (1995), 2201.
27. J.J. Halliwell, Phys. Rev. **D38** (1988), 2468.
28. See e.g., P. Ramond, *Field Theory: A Modern Primer* (2nd ed.), Addison-Wesley, 1989.

Figure Captions

Figure1-a: The plot of the function $f(\tau^1, \tau^2)$ for the range $\tau^1 : 0 - 1$ and $\tau^2 : 0.5 - 0.8$. The infinite summation has been truncated at -200 and 200 .

Figure1-b: The contour plot of $f(\tau^1, \tau^2)$, with the same range and the truncation points as in Figure 1 – *a*. The lines indicate the values (from bottom to top) 30, 28, 26, 24, 22, 20, 15 and 5.

Figure2-a: The trajectory of (τ^1, τ^2) determined by eqs.(21)-(24). The infinite summation in the definition of $f(\tau)$ has been truncated at -200 and 200 . $\hbar$ and α have been set unity. The initial conditions are $\tau^1 = 0.500$, $\tau^2 = 0.500$, $p_1 = 1.000$, $p_2 = 1.620$, $V = 1.000$ and $\sigma = 0.000$. Points $A - F$ and Z indicate typical points on the trajectory. A : the initial point, B : a point near the turning point ($p_2 = 0$), $C - F$: the points for which t is near integer, Z : the end point of the calculation. $A : (0.000, 0.500)$ at $t = 0.000$, $B : (0.727, 0.888)$ at $t = 0.675$, $C : (1.171, 0.760)$ at $t = 1.003$, $D : (1.551, 0.161)$ at $t = 2.057$, $E : (1.553, 0.031)$ at $t = 2.953$, $F : (1.549, 4.8 \times 10^{-3})$ at $t = 4.043$ and $Z : (1.549, 1.0 \times 10^{-3})$ at $t = 4.983$.

Figure2-b: The trajectory of (p_1, p_2) determined by eqs.(21)-(24). The initial conditions are the same as in Figure 2 – *a*. $A : (1.000, 1.620)$ at $t = 0.000$, $B : (0.949, -3.6 \times 10^{-3})$ at $t = 0.675$, $C : (0.949, -0.603)$ at $t = 1.003$, $D : (0.811, -5.301)$ at $t = 2.057$, $E : (-4.960, -29.22)$ at $t = 2.953$, $F : (-9.310, -175.3)$ at $t = 4.043$, and $Z : (-12.59, -820.4)$ at $t = 4.983$.

Figure2-c: The trajectory of (V, σ) determined by eqs.(21)-(24). The initial conditions are the same as in Figure 2 – *a*. $A : (1.000, 0.000)$ at $t = 0.000$, $B : (1.089, -0.235)$ at $t = 0.675$, $C : (1.193, -0.320)$ at $t = 1.003$, $D : (1.825, -0.452)$ at $t = 2.057$, $E : (2.774, -0.474)$ at $t = 2.953$, $F : (4.540, -0.423)$ at $t = 4.043$ and $Z : (6.597, -0.372)$ at $t = 4.983$.

Figure3-a: The value of $\dot{\tau}^1$ during the evolution shown in Figure 2 – *a, b, c*. $A : 0.500$ at $t = 0.000$, $B : 1.500$ at $t = 0.675$, $C : 1.100$ at $t = 1.003$, $D : 4.182 \times 10^{-2}$ at

$t = 2.057$, $E : -9.657 \times 10^{-3}$ at $t = 2.953$, $F : -4.290 \times 10^{-4}$ at $t = 4.043$
and $Z : -2.519 \times 10^{-5}$ at $t = 4.983$.

Figure3-b: The value of $\dot{\tau}^2$ during the evolution shown in Figure 2 – *a, b, c*. $A : 0.810$
at $t = 0.000$, $B : -5.678 \times 10^{-3}$ at $t = 0.675$, $C : -0.697$ at $t = 1.003$,
 $D : -0.273$ at $t = 2.057$, $E : -5.688 \times 10^{-2}$ at $t = 2.953$, $F : -8.078 \times 10^{-3}$
at $t = 4.043$ and $Z : -1.641 \times 10^{-3}$ at $t = 4.983$.

Figure3-c: The value of $\dot{V}$ during the evolution shown in Figure 2 – *a, b, c*. $A : 0.000$
at $t = 0.000$, $B : 0.257$ at $t = 0.675$, $C : 0.382$ at $t = 1.003$, $D : 0.825$ at
 $t = 2.057$, $E : 1.315$ at $t = 2.953$, $F : 1.922$ at $t = 4.043$ and $Z : 2.454$ at
 $t = 4.983$.

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/gr-qc/9511046v1>

This figure "fig2-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/gr-qc/9511046v1>

This figure "fig1-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/gr-qc/9511046v1>

This figure "fig2-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/gr-qc/9511046v1>